### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI EASTERN DIVISION

EDISON CARL HESTER,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
V.	)	No. 4:10CV2389 SNLJ
CITY OF ST. LOUIS, et al.,	)	
Defendants.	)	

#### MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court upon the motion of Edison Hester (registration no. 60053), an inmate at St. Louis City Justice Center, for leave to commence this action without payment of the required filing fee [Doc. #2]. For the reasons stated below, the Court finds that plaintiff does not have sufficient funds to pay an initial partial filing fee. Furthermore, based upon a review of the complaint, the Court finds that the complaint should be dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

# 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1)

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1), a prisoner bringing a civil action in forma pauperis is required to pay the full amount of the filing fee. If the prisoner has insufficient funds in his or her prison account to pay the entire fee, the Court must assess and, when funds exist, collect an initial partial filing fee of 20 percent of the greater of (1) the average monthly deposits in the prisoner's account, or (2) the

After payment of the initial partial filing fee, the prisoner is required to make monthly payments of 20 percent of the preceding month's income credited to the prisoner's account. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(2). The agency having custody of the prisoner will forward these monthly payments to the Clerk of Court each time the amount in the prisoner's account exceeds \$10, until the filing fee is fully paid. <u>Id.</u>

Plaintiff has submitted an affidavit and a certified copy of his prison account statement for the six-month period immediately preceding the submission of his complaint. A review of plaintiff's account indicates that he had no deposits and carries a negative balance with the facility. As a result, there are no funds from which to assess an initial partial filing fee.

## 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), the Court must dismiss a complaint filed in forma pauperis if the action is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. An action is frivolous if it "lacks an arguable basis in either law or fact." Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 328 (1989); Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 31 (1992). An action is malicious if it is undertaken for the purpose of harassing the named defendants and not for the purpose of vindicating a cognizable right.

Spencer v. Rhodes, 656 F. Supp. 458, 461-63 (E.D.N.C. 1987), aff'd 826 F.2d 1059 (4th Cir. 1987). A complaint fails to state a claim if it does not plead "enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face." Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007).

#### The Complaint

Plaintiff brings this action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against the City of St. Louis and the St. Louis Department of Corrections. Plaintiff alleges that the conditions at the St. Louis City Justice Center are unsafe and violate health and safety codes. Plaintiff says that the building is unsafe in case of fire, that there is lead paint, and that there are too many people in the dining area at one time. Plaintiff claims that he is "under duress being forced to swallow my food for being rushed out of the dining room with the timing being about 7 minutes."

#### **Discussion**

The complaint fails to state a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 because the alleged facts do not rise to the level of a constitutional violation.

Furthermore, plaintiff has not alleged that the City of St. Louis has a policy or custom that caused a deprivation of a fundamental right. Monell v. Dep't of Social Services, 436 U.S. 658, 690-91 (1978). And the St. Louis Department of Corrections

is not a suable entity. <u>Ketchum v. City of West Memphis, Ark.</u>, 974 F.2d 81, 81 (8th Cir. 1992). The complaint is legally frivolous for these reasons as well.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis [Doc. #2] is GRANTED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all other pending motions are DENIED as moot.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk shall not issue process or cause process to issue upon the complaint because the complaint is legally frivolous or fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or both.

An Order of Dismissal will accompany this Memorandum and Order.

Dated this 7th day of January, 2011.

STEPHEN N. LÍMBAUGH, JR.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE